

behalf of the workers in the airline industry who lost their jobs abruptly. To my great regret, they did not act.

At that time, many in this body claimed it was appropriate to wait. They said we ought to deal with assistance to the unemployed when we consider broader legislation to stimulate the economic recovery. Now almost 8 million Americans are worrying about how they will pay the rent or their mortgage. Millions of American parents have lost their health care insurance, and they are worrying what they will do if a child gets sick. Millions of families are wondering how they will put food on their Thanksgiving table this year. It would be unconscionable to tell these people to wait any longer. Extended unemployment benefits and help with health care coverage must be included in a stimulus package.

By extending unemployment compensation, we will be putting dollars into the hands of people who need the money immediately for their basic needs. The money will be spent quickly, which in turn provides the needed remedy for an ailing economy. We have an opportunity to do the right thing at the right time and for the right reasons. We must act quickly and in a bipartisan fashion. We cannot afford to wait until more people are laid off or more businesses fail. We must not leave our families to struggle without help or without hope.

If we have the will, we can forge a just and reasonable compromise that will ease the pain of this recession. When Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel was asked what was the most important commandment, he replied: Thou shall not sit by idly. That response points up the importance of acting when we have a chance to influence an outcome. During this time of crisis, let it not be said of the U.S. Congress that we sat idly by. Let us act with courage, and let us act now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I congratulate my colleague from Missouri. She said in just a few moments exactly what we need to hear as we consider this economic stimulus package.

I believe she has put a finger on it: We are being called on, across America, to rally behind our flag, our President, and our cause, that we should make certain when it comes to the economic stimulus package, we also keep in mind that all America is involved. It is the working families in America paying the payroll taxes into the Social Security trust fund who are funding all we are doing. The money we are spending to defend America against terrorism, the money we are spending to rebuild New York, the money we are spending to help the airline industry, the money we are spending for an economic stimulus all comes out of the Social Security trust fund, and all of

that money comes from the payroll workers across America.

When we talk about invigorating this economy and getting it moving forward again, what a difference in approach we have between the two political parties. On the House side, the Republicans came up with a stimulus package which I am afraid doesn't meet the test of encouraging consumer spending, doing it in a timely fashion, and not damaging the economy. Instead, what the House Republican package came up with was, sadly, a great deal of tax relief for the biggest corporations in America. This is profiteering in the name of patriotism.

Consider for a minute that these corporations would receive rebate checks for 15 years' worth of Federal income tax under the stimulus plan supported by the House of Representatives. IBM would receive \$1.4 billion from the Social Security trust fund; Ford, \$1 billion; General Motors, \$833 million. The list goes on and on. Billions and billions of dollars in corporate relief from the House Republican stimulus plan and precious little or nothing for the workers across America.

We know what will get this economy moving again. Give some money to the people who are having a tough time—having just lost their jobs—to keep their families together, and they will spend it. Of course they will. Give the people who just lost their jobs help in paying for health insurance, and they will use that help because they are as frightened as anyone that family members or their children will not be protected with health insurance. Those are the pillars of the Senate Democratic plan for stimulus: That we help those who have just been laid off, who are facing a difficult time.

We also provide tax rebates for 45 million low-income taxpayers who received no rebate earlier this year. People pay payroll taxes, pay into the Social Security trust fund. This time around, we believe they should receive some tax assistance.

We have business tax cuts, as well—a 10-percent bonus appreciation. I heard from businesses across Illinois: Give us some help in depreciating some of the things we purchase and we will purchase more. That can move the economy forward. It is a sensible plan.

We want to extend unemployment benefits an additional 13 weeks in all 50 States. This is not a radical suggestion. This is the course followed by President Bush's father. In the teeth of a recession, he said: We have to stand by the people who have lost their jobs. In America we have 7.5 million Americans who are out of work. We ought to stand by them and any laid off in the near future. We need to expand coverage to the people who do not receive unemployment insurance today.

We also know when it comes to this health insurance, unless we help people

buy health insurance once they have lost a job, they will have none; they are not likely to do so. Just do the math. The average unemployment check is \$230 a week; the average payment for private health insurance when you have lost your job is \$588 a month. It just does not work.

We have quite a contrast between the Republican approach of getting this economy moving forward and the Democratic approach. The Republican approach embodies tax cuts for the wealthy and profitable corporations and nothing for homeland security. I hope I get a moment to get to this issue.

When it comes to tax cuts for the wealthy, by speeding up the rate cuts, the Republican plan would give a new \$16,000-a-year tax break to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. Those are people making over \$1 million a year, receiving \$16,000 from the Republican tax stimulus. What a stimulus that is: For citizens making \$1 million a year, we want to give you \$16,000 more. That is not going to put money back into the economy, not nearly as much as helping the economy by giving the money to the average working family, the middle-income family across America.

When we give every millionaire a check from the Treasury for \$16,000, that is money being thrown away that could be used to deal with economic stimulus. That \$16,000 goes right out of the Social Security trust fund. Payroll taxes paid by average workers into the Social Security trust fund are being spent to give a \$16,000-a-year check to the wealthiest people in America—and to do it for 4 years under the Republican plan.

The Republican plan, in addition, with the accelerated tax cuts, costs \$27 billion in 2002—next year—and increases to \$121 billion over 10 years. Remember the advice we receive from people: Don't do anything that will hurt us in the long term. They are going to basically eat up any surplus we have in the future to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country. That makes no sense at all.

#### HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. I have a limited amount of time and will now reflect on the issue of homeland security. There are two ways to move the economy forward: Tax cuts and spending. The faster way, the more effective and immediate way, is through spending because as we spend on important projects and the money is spent, people are employed to do things important for America.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia and others have offered as part of the stimulus package a \$20 billion package dealing with homeland security. Where would that money go? For example, it

would go to law enforcement. In my State of Illinois, my Republican Governor has asked me to help come up with \$20 million so we can have a statewide communications network to deal with any emergencies, any crisis, any act of terrorism. This is money well spent. I want to give the Governor that money, but unless Senator BYRD's package moves forward, it is not likely that will happen.

The same thing on bioterrorism: We want to see money going into public health departments, State and local, to help them fight the war against bioterrorism. We need them. We have realized that with the anthrax crisis.

Look at the contrast: What the administration has called for to help public health departments on bioterrorism is \$300 million a year to go to State and local public health agencies. That amount is nothing. Remember, as well, the Republicans, in their stimulus plan coming from the House, want to give \$1.4 billion to one corporation—IBM. To give four or five times as much as might be spent to fight the war against bioterrorism is clearly a loss of our priority.

We also need to put money into security for Amtrak, for our airports, for our highways, for critical infrastructure across America. The money called for by Senator BYRD would go for that purpose. I think that is money well spent and invested in the infrastructure of this country.

People expect us to respond to this crisis with not only tax cuts that will truly move the economy forward but also with a spending package that makes America safer. It doesn't make America safer to give a \$16,000 check to a millionaire out of the Social Security trust fund. It might make America safer if we take that money and invest it in law enforcement, in protecting critical infrastructure such as water supplies, nuclear power plants, and the highways, and infrastructure across America.

Those are the differences, and they are critical differences.

I also make note of the fact that the editorial response to the Republican stimulus package so far has been uniformly negative. As a matter of fact, Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill referred to the House-Republican-backed stimulus package as just so much show business. We don't need show business on Capitol Hill; we need to get down to serious business. That serious business involves responding to our economic crisis and doing it in a timely fashion and a fair manner.

I salute the Senate Finance Committee for moving forward a package yesterday, on a partisan rollcall, I am sorry to report, but one that we will consider next week. I hope the Republicans will work with us quickly pass a bipartisan package. The sooner we can respond to this economy and its needs, the better it will be.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

#### DEVELOPING ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I listened carefully to my colleague from Illinois. I think what we are going to see next week is almost class warfare on the issue of the stimulus.

What is a stimulus? Stimulus is what really stimulates the economy. I think as we look at the difference in the positions of both parties, we come to the conclusion that for those who happen to have the circumstances that allow them to have accumulated capital, it is in our interests to encourage them to invest in inventories, expenditures, and so forth, so this economy can move. It doesn't move necessarily simply by government spending. These should be determined to be true stimulus matters.

I would like to reflect, as a member of the Finance Committee, on how we got into this situation relative to putting a bill together, under the Finance Committee leadership of the two leaders, Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY, who had worked together extraordinarily well on the tax package. It was a bipartisan package, so unlike what came out of the Finance Committee yesterday. It seemed as if the Republican participation in the process had been virtually eliminated by the Democratic majority and the Democratic majority leader. In the manner in which he dictated the terms and conditions, there would be virtually no input from the Republicans in that package.

As a consequence, I do admire the chairman, Senator BAUCUS, for insisting that the process at least go through the committee because, unlike what happened in the Energy Committee where the Democratic leader simply pulled the energy bill and there was no committee process; there was no input from the authorization committee, so the committee basically shut down, and the Democratic leader took it upon himself to work up an energy bill that we have yet to see. What we are seeing here is an extraordinary dictate of power from the Democratic leader who says: We are going to do it my way. We are not going to go through the process associated with the authorizing committees.

As a consequence, what happened yesterday in the Finance Committee was a partisan vote. We are going to start in with that package on Tuesday. If we are going to get anywhere, we are going to start in accommodating each other's points of view, working towards a bipartisan solution. Clearly, this country, and the President, wants to have this issue resolved. It should be resolved. But it has to be a true stimulus.

What I am doing is drawing a little bit of a parallel to the power politics of what is occurring here. We saw initially on the energy bill, as I have indicated, where the authorizing committee's jurisdiction was basically eliminated and the chairman of the committee saw fit to simply leave the obligation up to the Democratic leadership. That almost occurred in the Finance Committee but not quite.

As we look at the stimulus, I want to reflect one more time on what true stimulus is. True stimulus is the creation of jobs, the creation of jobs by urging the private sector to invest, initiate action. There is one issue before this body, and it is either going to be on the stimulus bill or perhaps we can make an arrangement with the Democratic leadership to take it up, debate it, vote up or down, and address the issues as they should be—and that is the issue of an energy bill.

One of the issues in that bill is the contentious issue of ANWR. Should it be opened? Should it not? We have seen the position of our President on numerous occasions who says it is an integral part of the Nation's energy policy to reduce our dependence on imported oil. The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, Vietnam Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, what do they say? I could go on and on. They have implored the Democratic leader to put this on the calendar, to take it up, vote on it. Their particular view of this issue is they don't believe we should send any more men and women to fight a war on foreign shores.

I am reminded of the comments of a former Member, Mark Hatfield, who was a pacifist. He said: I would vote for opening ANWR any day rather than send another man or woman to fight a war on foreign shores over oil.

I think that says a lot for American veterans. Make no mistake about it; we fought a war over oil in the Persian Gulf. Today we are buying oil from our enemy, whom we basically conquered in that war, Saddam Hussein. We are importing over a million barrels a day. Yet at the same time we are enforcing a no-fly zone over that country. We are putting at stake the lives of American men and women. As we take the oil from Iraq, put it in our planes, and enforce the no-fly zone, we bomb him. The consequence of that is he takes our money, develops a missile capability, maybe a biological capability, and aims it at our ally, Israel. Maybe that is an oversimplification of foreign policy, but it is not too far off.

Organized labor is totally aboard. For the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, maritime unions, seafarers unions, operating engineers, plumbers, pipefitters, carpenters and joiners, this is a jobs issue. Where can you find a stimulus that will generate roughly 250,000 jobs—these are U.S. jobs, these are union jobs in this country—other